

On Kuroda's proof of Hilbert's fourteenth problem in dimensions three and four

Pramod K. Sharma

e-mail: pksharma1944@yahoo.com

School Of Mathematics, Vigyan Bhawan, Khandwa Road,
INDORE-452 017, INDIA.

Abstract

We generalize [3, Lemma 2.2] and [4, Proposition 2.3] and deduce a positive result on Hilbert's fourteenth problem. Further, we give a relatively transparent and elementary proof of [3, Theorem 1.1].

1 Introduction

Let K be a field of characteristic zero. Let $K[\mathbf{X}] = K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ be the polynomial ring in n variables over K and let $K(\mathbf{X}) = K(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ be its field of fractions. The fourteenth problem of Hilbert asks whether K -algebra $L \cap K[\mathbf{X}]$ is finitely generated whenever L is a subfield of $K(\mathbf{X})$ containing K . Zariski [9] showed that $L \cap K(\mathbf{X})$ is a finitely generated K -algebra if the transcendence degree of L over K is ≤ 2 . Thus the problem has an affirmative answer for $n \leq 2$. However, a counter example was found by Nagata [7] for $n \geq 32$. Roberts [8] constructed a new counter example for $n = 7$. Freudenburg [6] gave a counter example for $n = 6$, and Daigle and Freudenburg [5] gave one for $n = 5$. Kuroda [3] and [4] has given counter examples in case $n = 4$ and $n = 3$. Thus Hilbert's fourteenth problem has been solved for all n . For $n = 4$, let γ and δ_{ij} be integers for $1 \leq i \leq 3$ and

$1 \leq j \leq 4$ such that $\gamma, \delta_{ij} \geq 1$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$ and $\delta_{i4} \geq 0$. Assume

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_1 &= X_4^\gamma - X_1^{-\delta_{11}} X_2^{\delta_{12}} X_3^{\delta_{13}} X_4^{\delta_{14}}, \\ \pi_2 &= X_4^\gamma - X_1^{\delta_{21}} X_2^{-\delta_{22}} X_3^{\delta_{23}} X_4^{\delta_{24}}, \\ \pi_3 &= X_4^\gamma - X_1^{\delta_{31}} X_2^{\delta_{32}} X_3^{-\delta_{33}} X_4^{\delta_{34}},\end{aligned}$$

and let $K(\pi)$ be the field of fractions of $K[\pi] = K[\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3]$. Then Kuroda [3, Theorem 1.1] proves: If

$$\frac{\delta_{11}}{\delta_{11} + \min(\delta_{21}, \delta_{31})} + \frac{\delta_{22}}{\delta_{22} + \min(\delta_{32}, \delta_{12})} + \frac{\delta_{33}}{\delta_{33} + \min(\delta_{13}, \delta_{23})} < 1 \quad \dots (*),$$

then $K(\pi) \cap K[\mathbf{X}]$ is not a finitely generated K -algebra. Moreover, $K(\pi) \cap K[\mathbf{X}]$ is not contained in the kernel $K[\mathbf{X}]^D$ for any locally nilpotent derivation D of $K[\mathbf{X}]$. Further, for $n = 3$, let γ and δ_{ij} be positive integers for $i, j = 1, 2$ and let

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_1 &= X_1^{\delta_{21}} X_2^{-\delta_{22}} - X_1^{-\delta_{11}} X_2^{\delta_{12}} \\ \pi_2 &= X_3^\gamma - X_1^{-\delta_{11}} X_2^{\delta_{12}} \\ \pi_3 &= 2X_1^{\delta_{21} - \delta_{11}} X_2^{\delta_{12} - \delta_{22}} - X_1^{-2\delta_{11}} X_2^{2\delta_{12}}.\end{aligned}$$

Then Kuroda [4, Theorem 1.1] states that: if

$$\frac{\delta_{11}}{\delta_{11} + \delta_{21}} + \frac{\delta_{22}}{\delta_{22} + \delta_{12}} < \frac{1}{2} \quad \dots\dots\dots (**),$$

then for $K(\pi) = K(\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3)$, $K(\pi) \cap K[X_1, X_2, X_3]$ is not a finitely generated K -algebra.

In proving the above results, the first main step is to show that $K(\pi) \cap K[\mathbf{X}] = \mathbf{K}[\pi] \cap \mathbf{k}[\mathbf{X}]$, and then show that this algebra is not finitely generated. In this note we shall show that the statement $K(\pi) \cap K[\mathbf{X}] = \mathbf{K}[\pi] \cap \mathbf{k}[\mathbf{X}]$ has common genus and deduce this fact, i.e., [3, Lemma 2.2] and [4, Proposition 2.3] are consequences of one algebraic result under a condition weaker than (*) and (**). To be precise: From the proof in [3] it is clear that the condition (*) implies that the matrix

$$T_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -\delta_{11} & \delta_{12} & \delta_{13} \\ \delta_{21} & -\delta_{22} & \delta_{23} \\ \delta_{31} & \delta_{32} & -\delta_{33} \end{pmatrix}$$

is invertible. We also note that the condition (**) implies invertibility of the matrix

$$T_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -\delta_{11} & \delta_{12} \\ \delta_{21} & -\delta_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

The converse is not true in both the cases. We prove [3, Lemma 2.2] and [4, Proposition 2.3] under the assumption that the corresponding matrices are invertible. We further show that the condition in [3, Theorem 1.1] is essential by giving an example wherein $K[\pi] \cap K[\mathbf{X}]$ is finitely generated if the condition $(*)$ fails. We also deduce a positive result [Theorem 2.8] on Hilbert's fourteenth problem using our algebraic result and give a relatively transparent and easy proof of [3, Theorem 1.1]. All rings are commutative with identity ($\neq 0$), and for any ring R , R^* denotes its group of units.

2 Main Results

We first record the following result due to Bass.

Lemma 2.1. [1, Proposition D.1.7]: *Let $A \subset B$ be a ring extension, where A and B are domains with quotient fields $Q(A)$ and $Q(B)$ respectively. Suppose that A is a unique factorization domain and that $B^* \cap A \subset A^*$. If B is flat over A , then $Q(A) \cap B = A$.*

Corollary 2.2. *Let A and B be integral domains contained in a common integral domain C . If A is unique factorization domain and C is flat over A such that $C^* \cap A \subset A^*$, then $Q(A) \cap B = A \cap B$ where $Q(A)$ is the field of fractions of A .*

Proof. The proof is immediate from the Lemma 2.1. □

Remark 2.3. In the Lemma 2.1, we can replace the condition $B^* \cap A \subset A^*$ by the assumption that B is integral over A .

Lemma 2.4. *Let $A \subset B$ be integral domains, where A is a unique factorization domain. If B is faithfully flat over A , then $Q(A) \cap B = A$ where $Q(A)$ is the field of fractions of A .*

Proof. The proof will follow from Lemma 2.1, if $B^* \cap A \subset A^*$. Let $\lambda \in B^* \cap A$. As A is an integral domain,

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{m_\lambda} A \xrightarrow{\eta} A/\lambda A \longrightarrow 0 \quad (1)$$

is an exact sequence of A -modules where m_λ is multiplication by λ , and η is the quotient map. Since B is faithfully flat, from the exact sequence 1, we get the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow B \xrightarrow{m_\lambda} B \xrightarrow{\eta} B/\lambda B \longrightarrow 0$$

As $\lambda \in B^*$, $B/\lambda B = 0$. Thus $A/\lambda A \otimes B \cong B/\lambda B = (0)$. Consequently, as B is faithfully flat, $A/\lambda A = (0)$. Thus $\lambda \in A^*$, and the result follows. $\square$

Theorem 2.5. *Let K be a field and X_i ; $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ be algebraically independent over K . Let $\pi_i = X_n^{\gamma_i} - X_1^{\alpha_{i1}} X_2^{\alpha_{i2}} \dots X_{i-1}^{\alpha_{i,i-1}} X_i^{-\alpha_{ii}} \dots X_n^{\alpha_{in}}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ where $\gamma_i \geq 1$, $\alpha_{ij} \geq 1$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$ and $\alpha_{in} \geq 0$. If for the matrix*

$$T_{n-1} = \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha_{11} & \alpha_{12} & \cdots & \alpha_{1n-1} \\ \alpha_{21} & -\alpha_{22} & \cdots & \alpha_{2n-1} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \alpha_{(n-1)1} & \cdots & \cdots & -\alpha_{(n-1)(n-1)} \end{pmatrix},$$

$\det T_{n-1} \neq 0$, then

- (i) $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_{n-1}, X_n$ are algebraically independent over K .
- (ii) The ring extension

$$K[\pi] = K[\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-1}] \subset K[X_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, X_n^{\pm 1}]$$

is flat.

Proof. (i) We have

$$K(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-1}) \subset K(X_n, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-1}) = K(X_n, M_1, \dots, M_{n-1}) = L \text{ (say)}$$

where $M_i = X_1^{\alpha_{i1}} \dots X_{i-1}^{\alpha_{i,i-1}} X_i^{-\alpha_{ii}} \dots X_n^{\alpha_{in-1}}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. We shall show that $K(X_1, \dots, X_n) \mid L$ is an algebraic field extension. Since $\det T_{n-1} \neq 0$, for any $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ there exists a row vector $f_i \in \mathbb{Q}^{n-1}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f_i T_{n-1} &= e_i = (0, \dots, 0, 1^{th}, 0, \dots, 0) \\ \Rightarrow (mf_i) T_{n-1} &= me_i \text{ for all } m \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose $m_i > 0$ such that $m_i f_i \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$. If $m_i f_i = (s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$, then

$$M_1^{s_1} \dots M_{n-1}^{s_{n-1}} = X_i^{m_i}.$$

Therefore $X_i^{m_i} \in L$. Thus $K(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ is algebraic over L . This proves (i).

(ii) From (i), $X_n, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-1}$ are algebraically independent over K . Therefore $K[\pi] \subset K[\pi, X_n, X_n^{-1}]$ is flat. Also

$$K[\pi, X_n, X_n^{-1}] = K[X_n, X_n^{-1}, M_1, \dots, M_{n-1}] \subset K[X_n, X_n^{-1}, M_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, M_n^{\pm 1}] = B$$

is flat. Now, note that the Laurent polynomial ring $K[X_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, X_n^{\pm 1}] = R$ is a graded ring over the free abelian group $(\mathbb{Z}^n, +)$ where the homogeneous component corresponding to $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is $KX_1^{\alpha_1} \dots X_n^{\alpha_n}$. Then the ring B is a graded subring of R over the subgroup H of $\mathbb{Z}^n$ generated by the set

$$\{(-\alpha_{11}, \alpha_{12}, \dots, \alpha_{1(n-1)}, 0), (\alpha_{21}, -\alpha_{22}, \dots, \alpha_{2(n-1)}, 0), \dots, (\alpha_{(n-1)1}, \dots, \alpha_{(n-1)(n-2)}, -\alpha_{(n-1)(n-1)}, 0), (0, \dots, 0, 1)\}$$

Therefore R is a free B -module. Hence (ii) follows. $\square$

Proposition 2.6. *Let K be a field and X_i ; $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ be algebraically independent over K . Let*

$$\pi_i = X_n^{\gamma_i} - X_1^{\alpha_{i1}} X_2^{\alpha_{i2}} \dots X_{(i-1)}^{\alpha_{i(i-1)}} X_i^{-\alpha_{ii}} \dots X_n^{\alpha_{in}}$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ where $\gamma_i \geq 1$, $\alpha_{ij} \geq 1$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$ and $\alpha_{in} \geq 0$. If for the matrix

$$T_{n-1} = \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha_{11} & \alpha_{12} & \dots & \alpha_{1(n-1)} \\ \alpha_{21} & -\alpha_{22} & \dots & \alpha_{2(n-1)} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \alpha_{(n-1)1} & \dots & \dots & -\alpha_{(n-1)(n-1)} \end{pmatrix}$$

$\det T_{n-1} \neq 0$, then for $K[\pi] = K[\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-1}]$

$$K(\pi) \cap K[X_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, X_n^{\pm 1}] = K[\pi]$$

where $K(\pi)$ is the field of fractions of $K[\pi]$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.5, the ring extension $K[\pi] \subset K[X_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, X_n^{\pm 1}]$ is flat, and $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-1}, X_n$ are algebraically independent over K . As $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-1}$ are algebraically independent over K , $K[\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-1}]$ is a unique factorization domain. As in the proof of the Theorem 2.5(ii), it is clear that $R = K[X_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, X_n^{\pm 1}]$ is free over its subring $B = K[X_n^{\pm 1}, M_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, M_{n-1}^{\pm 1}]$. Therefore R is faithfully flat over B . By Lemma 2.4, $R^* \cap B \subset B^*$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} R^* \cap B \cap K[\pi] &\subset B^* \cap K[\pi] \\ \implies R^* \cap K[\pi] &\subset B^* \cap K[\pi] \end{aligned}$$

since $K[\pi] \subset B$. Now the result will follow from Lemma 2.1 if we show that $B^* \cap K[\pi] \subset K[\pi]^* = K^*$. Since $X_n, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-1}$ are algebraically independent over K ,

$$K[\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-1}, X_n^{\pm 1}] = K[M_1, \dots, M_{n-1}, X_n^{\pm 1}]$$

is a unique factorization domain. We also note that $M_1, \dots, M_{n-1}, X_n$ are algebraically independent over K . Hence $B = K[M_1, \dots, M_{n-1}, X_n, 1/f]$, where $f = M_1 M_2 \dots M_{n-1} X_n$, is a unique factorization domain. Let for $\lambda \in K[\pi]$, λ is unit in B . Then there exists $\mu \in K[M_1, \dots, M_{n-1}, X_n]$ such that $\lambda\mu = f^m$ for some $m \geq 0$. Note that $K[\pi] \subset K[M_1, \dots, M_{n-1}, X_n]$. Therefore λ divides f^m in $K[M_1, \dots, M_{n-1}, X_n]$. Consequently

$$\lambda = aM_1^{\alpha_1} \dots M_{n-1}^{\alpha_{n-1}} X_n^{\alpha_n} \quad (\alpha_i \geq 0)$$

for some $a(\neq 0) \in K$. We have $\pi_i = X_n^{\gamma_i} - M_i X_n^{\alpha_{in}}$. Therefore $\lambda = aM_1^{\alpha_1} \dots M_{n-1}^{\alpha_{n-1}} X_n^{\alpha_n} \in K[\pi]$ implies

$$\alpha_n = 0 = \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_{n-1}.$$

This can be seen by putting $M_i = X_n^{p^i}$ for a sufficiently large prime p in the equation

$$\lambda = aM_1^{\alpha_1} \dots M_{n-1}^{\alpha_{n-1}} X_n^{\alpha_n}.$$

Hence $\lambda \in K^*$ and the result follows. $\square$

Remark 2.7. From the above result, [3, Lemma 2.2] is immediate.

We now prove a positive result on Hilbert's fourteenth problem using our results.

Theorem 2.8. *Let K be a field and let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ be algebraically independent over K . Let $M_1, M_2, \dots, M_t$ be monomials in $X_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, X_n^{\pm 1}$ algebraically independent over K . Then*

$$K(M_1, \dots, M_t) \cap K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$$

is a finitely generated K -algebra.

Proof. Since $M_1, M_2, \dots, M_t$ are algebraically independent over K ,

$$K[M_1^{\pm 1}, M_2^{\pm 1}, \dots, M_t^{\pm 1}] = K[M_1, M_2, \dots, M_t, 1/f],$$

where $f = M_1 M_2 \dots M_t$, is a unique factorization domain. Further,

$$K[M_1^{\pm 1}, M_2^{\pm 1}, \dots, M_t^{\pm 1}] \subset K[X_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, X_n^{\pm 1}]$$

is a faithfully flat ring extension (in fact a free extension). Hence, by Lemma 2.4,

$$K(M_1, M_2, \dots, M_t) \cap K[X_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, X_n^{\pm 1}] = K[M_1^{\pm 1}, M_2^{\pm 1}, \dots, M_t^{\pm 1}].$$

Therefore

$$K(M_1, M_2, \dots, M_t) \cap K[X_1, \dots, X_n] = K[M_1^{\pm 1}, M_2^{\pm 1}, \dots, M_t^{\pm 1}] \cap K[X_1, \dots, X_n].$$

Now, as $M_1, M_2, \dots, M_t$ are algebraically independent over K , an element

$$f = \sum \lambda_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t} M_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots M_t^{\alpha_t} \quad (\lambda_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t} \in K, \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}) \cdots (***)$$

is in $K[M_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, M_t^{\pm 1}] \cap K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ if and only if $M_1^{\alpha_1} M_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots M_t^{\alpha_t}$ is a monomial in $X_1, \dots, X_n$. Let $M_i = X_1^{\gamma_{i1}} \cdots X_n^{\gamma_{in}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$ and let

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{11} & \cdots & \gamma_{1n} \\ \gamma_{21} & \cdots & \gamma_{2n} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \gamma_{t1} & \cdots & \gamma_{tn} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus in the equation $(***)$, all power-tuples $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t)$ are in the semi-group

$$S = \{(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_t) \in \mathbb{Z}^t \mid (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_t)U = (a_1, \dots, a_t) \text{ where } a_i \geq 0\}.$$

By Gordan's Lemma [2], S is finitely generated. Hence the result follows. $\square$

We shall now deduce [4, Proposition 2.3]. Observe that the condition $(**)$, i.e.,

$$\frac{\delta_{11}}{\delta_{11} + \delta_{21}} + \frac{\delta_{22}}{\delta_{22} + \delta_{12}} < \frac{1}{2}$$

implies the determinant of the matrix

$$T_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -\delta_{11} & \delta_{12} \\ \delta_{21} & -\delta_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

is non-zero. If not, then there exist $(t, s) \neq (0, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $(t, s)T_2 = 0$. Hence $-t\delta_{11} + s\delta_{21} = 0$ and $t\delta_{12} - s\delta_{22} = 0$. It is easy to see that $t \geq 0$ if and

only if $s \geq 0$. Moreover, $t = 0$ if and only if $s = 0$. Let $t \geq s > 0$. Then $\frac{s}{t} \leq 1$. Hence $\delta_{12} = \frac{s}{t} \delta_{22} \leq \delta_{22}$. This gives

$$\frac{\delta_{22}}{\delta_{22} + \delta_{12}} \geq \frac{\delta_{22}}{\delta_{22} + \delta_{22}} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Further, if $s \geq t > 0$, then

$$\frac{\delta_{11}}{\delta_{11} + \delta_{21}} \geq \frac{\delta_{11}}{\delta_{11} + \delta_{11}} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Thus in any case we arrive at a contradiction to our assumption. Hence $\det T_2 \neq 0$. The converse is not true follows by taking $\delta_{11} = 3, \delta_{12} = \delta_{22} = \delta_{21} = 1$. Now assume $\det T_2 \neq 0$. To prove [4, Proposition 2.3] under this assumption we first note the following:

Lemma 2.9. *Let R be a unique factorization domain and K its field of fractions. Let $L|K$ be an algebraic field extension. If $x \in L$ is integral over R , then $R[x]$ is finitely generated free R -module.*

Proof. Let $f(Z) \in R[Z]$ be a monic polynomial of least degree such that $f(x) = 0$. Then $f(Z)$ is irreducible in $R[Z]$ and has content 1. Therefore $f(Z)$ is irreducible in $K[Z]$. Since $f(Z)$ is monic, it is easy to see that $f(Z)K[Z] \cap R[Z] = f(Z)R[Z]$. Therefore $R[Z]/(f(Z)) \cong R[x]$ is a finitely generated free R -module. $\square$

Theorem 2.10. *Let X_1, X_2, X_3 be algebraically independent over a field K . Let*

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1 &= X_1^{\delta_{21}} X_2^{-\delta_{22}} - X_1^{-\delta_{11}} X_2^{\delta_{12}}, \\ \pi_2 &= X_3^\gamma - X_1^{-\delta_{11}} X_2^{\delta_{12}}, \\ \pi_3 &= 2X_1^{\delta_{21}-\delta_{11}} X_2^{\delta_{12}-\delta_{22}} - X_1^{-2\delta_{11}} X_2^{2\delta_{12}}, \end{aligned}$$

where γ and δ_{ij} are positive integers for $i, j = 1, 2$. Then if for

$$T_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -\delta_{11} & \delta_{12} \\ \delta_{21} & -\delta_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

$\det T_2 \neq 0$, π_1, π_2, π_3 are algebraically independent over K . Moreover, $K(\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3) \cap K[X_1, X_2, X_3] = K[\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3] \cap K[X_1, X_2, X_3]$.

Proof. Since $\det T_2 \neq 0$, there exists a row vector $(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that

$$(m, n) \begin{pmatrix} -\delta_{11} & \delta_{12} \\ \delta_{21} & -\delta_{22} \end{pmatrix} = (k, 0)$$

for some $k > 0$. Therefore

$$(X_1^{-\delta_{11}} X_2^{\delta_{12}})^m (X_1^{\delta_{21}} X_2^{-\delta_{22}})^n = X_1^k$$

Thus

$$X_1^k \in K[\pi_1, \pi_2, X_3] = K[X_1^{-\delta_{11}} X_2^{\delta_{12}}, X_1^{\delta_{21}} X_2^{-\delta_{22}}, X_3].$$

Similarly, there exists an integral $l > 0$ such that $X_2^l \in K[\pi_1, \pi_2, X_3]$. Consequently $K[X_1, X_2, X_3]$ is integral over $K[\pi_1, \pi_2, X_3]$. Thus

$$\text{Tr.deg.}_K K(\pi_1, \pi_2, X_3) = 3 \quad \cdots (i)$$

Hence

$$2 \leq \text{Tr.deg.}_K K(\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3) \leq 3, \quad \cdots (ii)$$

since $K[\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3] \subset K[\pi_1, \pi_2, X_3]$. Now, note that $\pi_2 - \pi_1 + X_1^{\delta_{21}} X_2^{-\delta_{22}} = X_3^\gamma$ and $\pi_1^2 + \pi_3 = X_1^{2\delta_{21}} X_2^{-2\delta_{22}}$. Therefore $(X_3^\gamma + (\pi_1 - \pi_2))^2 = \pi_1^2 + \pi_3$. Hence, $X_3^{2\gamma} + 2(\pi_1 - \pi_2)X_3^\gamma + (\pi_1 - \pi_2)^2 - (\pi_1^2 + \pi_3) = 0$, i.e., X_3^γ is integral over $K[\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3]$. Therefore, in view of (i) and (ii), $\text{Tr.deg.}_K K(\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3) = 3$. This proves that π_1, π_2, π_3 are algebraically independent over K . For the last part of the statement, note that $K[\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3]$ is a unique factorization domain. As X_3 is integral over it, $K[\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3, X_3]$ is a free $K[\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3]$ -module by Lemma 2.9. We have

$$K[\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3, X_3] = K[X_1^{-\delta_{11}} X_2^{\delta_{12}}, X_1^{\delta_{21}} X_2^{-\delta_{22}}, X_3] \subset K[X_1^{\pm 1}, X_2^{\pm 1}, X_3^{\pm 1}].$$

Therefore, as in the proof of Theorem 2.5, $K[X_1^{\pm 1}, X_2^{\pm 1}, X_3^{\pm 1}]$ is $K[\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3, X_3]$ -free. Consequently $K[X_1^{\pm 1}, X_2^{\pm 1}, X_3^{\pm 1}]$ is $K[\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3]$ -free module. Thus by Lemma 2.4,

$$K(\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3) \cap K[X_1, X_2, X_3] = K[\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3] \cap K[X_1, X_2, X_3]$$

□

At the end, we show that [3, Theorem 1.1] is not true if instead of (*) condition we assume that determinant of the matrix T_{n-1} is non-zero. This is consequence of the following Lemma.

Lemma 2.11. *Let K be a field of characteristic $\neq 2$. If $X_i; i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ are algebraically independent over K , then*

$$K[X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4] \cap K[X_4 - X_1^{-1}X_2X_3, X_4 - X_1X_2^{-1}X_3, X_4 - X_1X_2X_3^{-1}] = K.$$

Proof. Let a, b, c, x be algebraically independent over K . Replacing X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4 by ab, bc, ca and x respectively, the statement of Lemma amounts to proving:

$$K[ab, bc, ca, x] \cap K[x - c^2, x - a^2, x - b^2] = K.$$

We shall prove this result in steps.

Step 1. A monomial $a^ib^jc^k \in K[ab, bc, ca]$ if and only if $i + j + k$ is an even integer and $i + j \geq k, j + k \geq i, i + k \geq j$.

Let us note that the monomials ab, bc, ca satisfy the conditions in the statement. Therefore any monomial $a^ib^jc^k$ in $K[ab, bc, ca]$ also satisfies the same conditions. Now, let $a^ib^jc^k$ be a non-constant monomial such that $i + j + k$ is even and $i + j \geq k, j + k \geq i, i + k \geq j$. We shall show that $a^ib^jc^k \in K[ab, bc, ca]$ by induction on $i + j + k$. Clearly $i + j + k \geq 2$. If $i + j + k = 2$, then the monomial is either ab or bc or ca and hence is in $K[ab, bc, ca]$. Assume $i + j + k > 2$, and let $i \geq j \geq k$. If $k = 0$, then $i = j$ and the result follows. Thus assume $k \geq 1$. As $i + j + k$ is even we can not have $i = j = k = 1$. Therefore $i + j \geq k + 2$. Then $a^ib^jc^k = (a^{i-1}b^{j-1}c^k)(ab)$, and $a^{i-1}b^{j-1}c^k$ satisfies the condition of the statement. Therefore, by induction, $a^{i-1}b^{j-1}c^k \in K[ab, bc, ca]$. Hence the statement is true.

Step 2. $K[ab, bc, ca] \cap K[x - a^2, x - b^2, x - c^2] = K$.

We have $K[x - a^2, x - b^2, x - c^2] = K[b^2 - a^2, c^2 - a^2][x - a^2]$. Let $f(ab, bc, ca) \in K[ab, bc, ca]$ be a non-constant polynomial in $K[b^2 - a^2, c^2 - a^2][x - a^2]$. Then it is immediate that

$$f(ab, bc, ca) = g(b^2 - a^2, c^2 - a^2) \in K[b^2 - a^2, c^2 - a^2]. \quad \dots (i)$$

We can assume that f and g are homogeneous of same degree d . Let $(b^2 - a^2)^i(c^2 - a^2)^j$ be the term in $g(b^2 - a^2, c^2 - a^2)$ with largest i . We have $i + j = d$. If $i > d/2$, then by Step 1, the monomial $b^{2i}c^{2j}$ is not in $K[ab, bc, ca]$, since $2j < 2i$. Therefore (i) does not hold in this case. Similarly if $(b^2 - a^2)^i(c^2 - a^2)^j$ is the term in $g(b^2 - a^2, c^2 - a^2)$ with largest j and $j > d/2$, (i) can not hold. Thus assume $i = j = d/2$. Then $(b^2 - a^2)^{d/2}(c^2 - a^2)^{d/2} \in K[ab, bc, ca]$. This gives that $a^{2d} \in K[ab, bc, ca]$, which is not true by Step 1. Thus (i) does not hold in this case as well. Consequently Step 2 is proved.

Step 3. If $\text{Char}.K = 0$, then the result of the Lemma holds.

We have $K[ab, bc, ca, x] \cap K[x - a^2, x - b^2, x - c^2] = K[ab, bc, ca][x] \cap K[b^2 - a^2, c^2 - a^2][x - a^2]$. Let

$$f = \sum_{i=0}^d f_i x^i = \sum_{i=0}^d g_i (x - a^2)^i,$$

where $f_i \in K[ab, bc, ca]$ and $g_i \in K[b^2 - a^2, c^2 - a^2]$ be a non-constant polynomial of least degree d in x in the intersection. We shall first see that $d = 0$. Note that the rings $K[ab, bc, ca, x]$ and $K[x - a^2, b^2 - a^2, c^2 - a^2]$ are both closed with respect to partial derivative $\delta/\delta x$. Thus if $d \geq 1$, then operating $\delta/\delta x$ on the both sides we arrive at a contradiction to minimality of d . Therefore $d = 0$, and $f_0 = g_0 \in K[ab, bc, ca] \cap K[b^2 - a^2, c^2 - a^2]$. Now, the result follows from Step 2.

Step 4. If characteristic of K is $p > 3$, then $K[ab, bc, ca][x] \cap K[b^2 - a^2, c^2 - a^2][x - a^2] = K$.

As in step 3, let

$$f = \sum_{i=0}^d f_i x^i = \sum_{i=0}^d g_i (x - a^2)^i \quad \dots (ii)$$

be a non-constant polynomial of least degree d in x in the intersection. If $d = 0$, then the statement follows by Step 2. Next, if $d = 1$ then comparing the coefficients of powers of x on both sides we get $f_1 = g_1$ and $f_0 = g_0 - g_1 a^2$. By Step 2, $f_1 = g_1 = \lambda (\neq 0) \in K$. Hence $f_0 = g_0 - \lambda a^2$. This implies that either a^2 or b^2 or c^2 is in $K[ab, bc, ca]$. This however is not true by Step 1. Now assume $d > 1$. Unless all non-zero terms other than that of degree 1 have exponent in x divisible by p , we can argue as in case of $\text{Char}.K = 0$ and conclude $d = 0$. In this case the assertion is already proved. Therefore assume that all non-zero terms other than those of degree 1 have power of x divisible by p . Now, let $q = p^e (e \geq 1)$ be the highest power of p which divides all exponents of x other than 1 in non-zero term. Let $d = mq$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} f &= f_0 + f_1 x + f_q x^q + \dots + f_d x^{mq} \\ &= g_0 + g_1 (x - a^2) + \dots + g_d (x - a^2)^{mq} \\ \Rightarrow \quad f_0 &= g_0 - g_1 a^2 + \text{terms with higher power of } a^2, \text{ and } f_1 = g_1. \end{aligned}$$

If $f_1 \neq 0$, then by Step 2, $f_1 = g_1 = \lambda (\neq 0) \in K$. Therefore $f_0 = g_0 - \lambda a^2 + \text{terms with higher power of } a^2$. This, however, is not true as seen above.

Thus $f_1 = 0 = g_1$. Put $Y = X^q$. Then

$$f = f_0 + f_q Y + \cdots + f_d Y^m = g_0 + g_q(Y - a^{2q}) + \cdots + g_d(Y - a^{2q})^m \quad \dots (iii)$$

Here $f \in K[Y, ab, ac, bc] \cap K[b^2 - a^2, c^2 - a^2][Y - a^{2q}]$. Differentiating both sides of equation (iii) with respect to Y we get, as in Step 3, $m = 0$ since if $m = 1$, then $f_q = g_q$, $f_0 = g_0 - g_q a^2$. As $f_q = g_q \in K[ab, bc, ca] \cap K[b^2 - a^2, c^2 - a^2] = K$. By Step 2 $f_q = g_q = \lambda (\neq 0) \in K$. Then $f_0 = g_0 - \lambda a^2 \in K[ab, bc, ca]$. Therefore, as seen above, a^2 or b^2 or c^2 belong to $K[ab, bc, ca]$, which is not true in view of Step 1. Thus $m = 0$, and assertion holds by Step 2. $\square$

Remark 2.12. The result is not true if characteristic of K is 2. In this case $(b^2 - a^2)(c^2 - a^2) + (x - a^2)^2 = (bc)^2 - (ac)^2 - (ab)^2 + x^2 \neq 0$ is in $K[x - a^2, x - b^2, x - c^2] \cap K[x, ab, bc, ca]$.

3 $K[\pi] \cap K[\mathbf{X}]$ is not finitely generated

In the notations of introduction the main assertion of [3, Theorem 1.1] is that $K[\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3] \cap K[X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4]$ is not a finitely generated K - algebra. We shall give a relatively transparent and easy proof of this fact. Put $Y_1 = X_1^{-\delta_{11}} X_2^{\delta_{12}} X_3^{\delta_{13}} X_4^{\delta_{14}}$, $Y_2 = X_1^{\delta_{21}} X_2^{-\delta_{22}} X_3^{\delta_{23}} X_4^{\delta_{24}}$, $Y_3 = X_1^{\delta_{31}} X_2^{\delta_{32}} X_3^{-\delta_{33}} X_4^{\delta_{34}}$ and $Y_4 = X_4^\gamma$.

Then $K[\pi] = K[\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3] = K[Y_4 - Y_1, Y_4 - Y_2, Y_4 - Y_3]$ and Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4 are algebraically independent by Theorem 2.5(i). As in [3], let E be the K -derivation $E = \sum_{i=1}^4 \delta / \delta Y_i$ on $K[Y] = K[Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4]$. We shall use the elementary facts that $K[Y]^E = K[Y_4 - Y_1, Y_4 - Y_2, Y_4 - Y_3]$ and $K[Y_2, Y_3]^E = K[Y_2 - Y_3]$. Instead of giving complete proofs again, we shall prove the main assertions in which our proof differs to that in [3].

The assertion in [3, Lemma 2.4] is most important for the proof of [3, Theorem 1.1]. Further [3, Lemma 3.1] is crucial for the proof of [3, Lemma 2.4]. We, instead, use the following simple result.

Lemma 3.1. *There exist +ve integers $p_i; i = 1, 2, 3$ such that for $p = p_1 + p_2 + p_3$, $p_i \geq p\xi_i$. Moreover, $f_0 = (Y_3 - Y_2)^{p_1}(Y_3 - Y_1)^{p_2}(Y_2 - Y_1)^{p_3} \in K[\mathbf{X}]$.*

Proof. Since $\xi_1 + \xi_2 + \xi_3 < 1$, there exists a +ve integer p such that $p(1 - \xi_1 - \xi_2 - \xi_3) \geq 3$, i.e., $p - p\xi_1 - p\xi_2 - p\xi_3 \geq 3$. Therefore there exist +ve integers $p_i; i = 1, 2, 3$ such that $p = p_1 + p_2 + p_3$ where $p_i \geq p\xi_i$. We have

$$f_0 = (Y_3 - Y_2)^{p_1}(Y_3 - Y_1)^{p_2}(Y_2 - Y_1)^{p_3}$$

$$= Y_1^{p_2+p_3} Y_2^{p_1} (Y_2^{-1} Y_3 - 1)^{p_1} (Y_1^{-1} Y_3 - 1)^{p_2} (Y_1^{-1} Y_2 - 1)^{p_3}.$$

From this, one can easily see that the power of X_1 in any term of $f_0 \in K[Y_1, Y_2, Y_3]$ is larger than $-(p_2 + p_3)\delta_{11} + p_1\delta_{21} + (p_1 - i)\delta_{31} - (p_1 - i)\delta_{21}$ for some $0 \leq i \leq p_1$, since clearly the power of X_1 in each term of $(Y_1^{-1} Y_3 - 1)^{p_2}$ and $(Y_1^{-1} Y_2 - 1)^{p_3}$ is positive. Now

$$\begin{aligned} -(p_2 + p_3)\delta_{11} + p_1\delta_{21} + (p_1 - i)\delta_{31} - (p_1 - i)\delta_{21} &= -(p_2 + p_3)\delta_{11} + (p_1 - i)\delta_{31} + i\delta_{21} \\ &\geq -(p_2 + p_3)\delta_{11} + p_1 \min(\delta_{21}, \delta_{31}) \\ &= -p\delta_{11} + p_1(\delta_{11} + \min(\delta_{21}, \delta_{31})) \\ &= (p_1 - p\xi_1)(\delta_{11} + \min(\delta_{21}, \delta_{31})) \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

since $p_1 \geq p\xi_1$. Similarly we can see that powers of X_2 and X_3 in f_0 are also ≥ 0 . Thus the result follows. $\square$

Remark 3.2. It is easy to prove [3, Lemma 2.4(i)] from the above result, but that is not pertinent to the main result.

Before we proceed further, to make this proof self contained, we give an alternative proof of [3, Lemma 2.3].

Lemma 3.3. *Let $f \in K[\pi] \cap K[\mathbf{X}]$. If $(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) \in \text{Supp.}(f)$ and $a_4 > 0$, then $a_1 + a_2 + a_3 > 0$.*

Proof. We have

$$f = \sum \lambda_{a,b,c} (Y_4 - Y_1)^a (Y_4 - Y_2)^b (Y_4 - Y_3)^c$$

where $\lambda_{a,b,c} \in K$ and $(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^3$. If $a + b + c > 0$, then in a term of the type $\lambda(Y_4 - Y_1)^a (Y_4 - Y_2)^b (Y_4 - Y_3)^c$, when expanded, $\lambda Y_4^{a+b+c} = \lambda X_4^{(a+b+c)\gamma}$ occurs, and also $\lambda X_4^{(a+b+c-1)\gamma} (-Y_1)$ occurs wherein power of X_1 is < 0 . As $f(X) \in K[X]$, the term $\lambda X_4^{(a+b+c-1)\gamma} (-Y_1)$ has to cancel out. Thus as Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4 are algebraically independent over K , $-\lambda X_4^{(a+b+c-1)\gamma} (-Y_1)$ shall also appear in the expansion. Therefore f shall contain an expression of the form $-\lambda(Y_4 - Y_1)^{a_1} (Y_4 - Y_2)^{b_1} (Y_4 - Y_3)^{c_1}$ where $a+b+c = a_1+b_1+c_1$. In that case we also get the term $-\lambda Y_4^{a_1+b_1+c_1} = -\lambda X_4^{(a_1+b_1+c_1)\gamma}$ in the expansion of f which cancels out $\lambda X_4^{(a+b+c)\gamma}$. All other expressions in the expansion of f have the form $\lambda Y_4^a Y_1^b Y_2^c Y_3^d$ where $(b, c, d) \neq (0, 0, 0)$. This expression as a

monomial in X_i 's is of the form $\lambda X_1^{a_1} X_2^{a_2} X_3^{a_3} X_4^t$ where $(a_1, a_2, a_3) = (b, c, d)T_3$ for

$$T_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -\delta_{11} & \delta_{12} & \delta_{13} \\ \delta_{21} & -\delta_{22} & \delta_{23} \\ \delta_{31} & \delta_{32} & -\delta_{33} \end{pmatrix}$$

Further, $t = a\gamma + b\delta_{14} + c\delta_{24} + d\delta_{34}$. As determinant of T_3 is not zero, $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \neq (0, 0, 0)$ if and only if $(b, c, d) \neq (0, 0, 0)$. Hence the result follows. $\square$

We now proceed as in [3], but assume $\mathfrak{S}$ to be the set of all homogeneous polynomials F of degree $p + q$ in $K[\pi] = K[Y]^E$ such that $F = f_0 Y_4^q +$ terms of lower degree in Y_4 , where powers of X_2 and X_3 are ≥ 0 for any $b \in \text{Supp}.F$. To complete the proof of Lemma 2.4 (ii) we need to show the existence of $F \in \mathfrak{S}$ such that power of X_1 is ≥ 0 for all $b \in \text{Supp}.F$. If this is not true then for any $F \in \mathfrak{S}$ there exists $b = (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) \in \text{Supp}.F$ such that $-b_1\delta_{11} + b_2\delta_{21} + b_3\delta_{31} < 0$. Then $-b_1\delta_{11} + (b_2 + b_3)\min(\delta_{21}, \delta_{31}) < 0$. Now, let for any $F \in \mathfrak{S}$

$$e = \max\{b_4 | b = (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) \in \text{Supp}.F, \text{ and } -b_1\delta_{11} + (b_2 + b_3)\min(\delta_{21}, \delta_{31}) < 0\}$$

and

$$d = \max\{b_1 | b = (b_1, b_2, b_3, e) \in \text{Supp}.F\}.$$

Define as in [3], $O(F) = (d, e)$ and consider the maximal element $F \in \mathfrak{S}$ with respect to the lexicographic ordering in $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Let $h \in K[Y_2, Y_3]$ be the coefficient of $Y_1^d Y_4^e$ in F . We, now, need to prove [3, Lemma 3.2]. As, in its proof in [3], if $\lambda Y_2^{c_2} Y_3^{c_3} \in E(h)$ where $\lambda (\neq 0) \in K$, then as $E(F) = 0$, there exists $(d, c_2, c_3, e + 1) \in \text{Supp}.F$. By definition of e ,

$$-d\delta_{11} + (c_2 + c_3)\min(\delta_{21}, \delta_{31}) \geq 0 \quad \cdots (i)$$

We claim that if $(d, l_2, l_3, e) \in \text{supp } F$, then $-d\delta_{11} + (l_2 + l_3)\min(\delta_{21}, \delta_{31}) < 0$. By definition of e , there exists (a_1, a_2, a_3, e) in $\text{supp } F$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & -a_1\delta_{11} + (a_2 + a_3)\min(\delta_{21}, \delta_{31}) < 0 \\ \Rightarrow & -d\delta_{11} + (l_2 + l_3)\min(\delta_{21}, \delta_{31}) < 0 \quad \cdots (ii) \end{aligned}$$

since by choice of d , $a_1 \leq d$, and $l_2 + l_3 \leq a_2 + a_3$. Hence the claim follows. From this, as $c_2 + c_3 + 1 = l_2 + l_3$, we get

$$-d\delta_{11} + (c_2 + c_3)\min(\delta_{21}, \delta_{31}) < 0.$$

This contradicts (i). Hence the proof of [3 Lemma 3.2] follows.

For the final part of the proof, for $s = p + q - d - e$ and $d = \bar{p}_2 + \bar{p}_3$, consider

$$G = (Y_3 - Y_2)^s (Y_3 - Y_1)^{\bar{p}_2} (Y_2 - Y_1)^{\bar{p}_3} (Y_4 - Y_1)^e$$

Then G is homogeneous of degree $p + q$ and $\lambda(Y_3 - Y_2)^s Y_1^d Y_4^e$ appears in the expansion of G with $\lambda(\neq 0) \in K$. To complete the argument as in [3], we need to show that powers of X_2 and X_3 are ≥ 0 in G . As powers of X_2, X_3 in Y_4 and Y_1 are ≥ 0 , clearly the same holds for $(Y_4 - Y_1)^e$. Thus to prove our assertion it suffices to show that the same holds for $(Y_3 - Y_2)^s (Y_3 - Y_1)^{\bar{p}_2} (Y_2 - Y_1)^{\bar{p}_3}$. Let

$$\bar{p} = s + \bar{p}_2 + \bar{p}_3 = p + q - e = s + d.$$

Then as $e < q$, $\bar{p} > p$. Therefore

$$\bar{p}(1 - \xi_1 - \xi_2 - \xi_3) > p(1 - \xi_1 - \xi_2 - \xi_3) \geq 3. \quad \dots (iii)$$

From the equation (ii), it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} s \min(\delta_{21}, \delta_{31}) &< d\delta_{11} \\ \Rightarrow s &< (s + d)\xi_1 = \bar{p}\xi_1 \quad \dots (iv) \end{aligned}$$

By the equation (iii),

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{p} - \bar{p}\xi_1 - \bar{p}(\xi_2 + \xi_3) &\geq 3 \\ \Rightarrow s + d - \bar{p}\xi_1 - \bar{p}(\xi_2 + \xi_3) &\geq 3 \\ \Rightarrow d - \bar{p}(\xi_2 + \xi_3) &\geq 3 \quad \text{by (iv)} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we can write $d = \bar{p}_2 + \bar{p}_3$ such that $\bar{p}_2 > \bar{p}\xi_2$, $\bar{p}_3 > \bar{p}\xi_3$. Then the claim follows from the Lemma 3.1. The rest of the argument is same as in [3]. This completes the proof of our claim. $\square$

Acknowledgement

I am thankful to Prakash Bhagat, discussions with whom clarified parts of calculations in [3].

References

- [1] Arno Van den Essen, Polynomial automorphisms and the Jacobian Conjecture (Progress In Mathematics, Vol.190), Birkhauser, 2004.
- [2] Winfried Bruns and Joseph Gubeladze, Semigroup algebra and discrete geometry, Lecture Notes June/ July 2000 (Summer School On Toric Geometry, Grenoble).
- [3] Shigeru Kuroda, A counter example to the fourteenth problem of Hilbert in dimension four, Jr. of Algebra, 279(2004), 126-134.
- [4] Shigeru Kuroda, A counter example to the fourteenth problem of Hilbert in dimension three, Michigan Jr. of Mathematics (To appear).
- [5] D. Daigle, G. Freudenburg, A counter example to the fourteenth problem of Hilbert in dimension five, Jr. of Algebra, 221(1999), 528-535.
- [6] G. Freudenburg, A counter example to the fourteenth problem of Hilbert in dimension six, Transform. Groups, 5(2000), 61-71.
- [7] M. Nagata, On the fourteenth problem of Hilbert, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, 1958, Cambridge University Press, London, New-York, 1960, 459-462.
- [8] P. Roberts, An infinitely generated symbolic blow-up in a power series ring, and a new counter example to Hilbert's fourteenth problem, Jr. of Algebra, 132(1990), 461-473.
- [9] O. Zariski, Interpretations algebrico-geometriques du quatorzieme problem de Hilbert , Bull. Sci. Math., 78(1954),155-168.